



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/616,091	07/08/2003	Mark Davis	1070P3821	9656
53483	7590	07/27/2009		
KACVINSKY LLC 4500 BROOKTREE ROAD SUITE 102 WEXFORD, PA 15090				
EXAMINER				
LEE, TING ZHOU				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2173				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
07/27/2009		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

evergot@kacvinskyllaw.com
sbartl@kacvinskyllaw.com

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No. 10/616,091	Applicant(s) DAVIS, MARK
Examiner TING ZHOU	Art Unit 2173

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 13 July 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: _____.
Claim(s) objected to: _____.
Claim(s) rejected: 6, 7, 9, 10, 16, 17, 19, 20, 27-31 and 37-41.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____.
13. ☐ Other: _____.

/Ting Zhou/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2173

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The applicant's arguments have been fully considered, however, they are not persuasive. The applicant argues that a sliding mechanism is described in the specification as a physical or mechanical sliding mechanism (i.e. "implemented in handheld devices that slide open or unfold to present extended screen area...") and that the software control feature of selecting a corner of the display and sliding it bigger is not a sliding mechanism. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). *Dyszel* and *Windows* teach that the displayed screen can be changed from one display mode to another display mode by sliding the screen, which is performed using a standard mouse (i.e. selecting a corner of the screen with the mouse and sliding it into a rectangular shape). Therefore, since *Dyszel* and *Windows* teach sliding the screen using a mouse, the examiner respectfully maintains that the combination teaches the subject limitations.

With respect to claims 37-41, the applicant argues that a "folding mechanism" is described in the specification as a physical or mechanical folding mechanism (i.e. "implemented in handheld device that slide open or unfold to present the extended screen area") and that the software control feature of expanding or collapsing a divider is not a folding mechanism. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). *Sherer* teaches that the size of the display area can be changed by folding the divider (i.e. performing functions such as expanding and collapsing the divider); the function of expanding and collapsing is performed via selection of the corresponding button using an input device such as a mouse (column 4, lines 7-47 and column 5, lines 59-61). Therefore, since *Dyszel*, *Windows* and *Sherer* teach folding using a mouse device, the examiner respectfully maintains that the combination teaches the subject limitations.

The applicant's arguments have not placed the application in condition for allowance, therefore, the rejections made in the final office action dated 5/11/2009 for pending claims 6-7, 9-10, 16-17, 19-20, 27-31 and 37-41 remain.